

that dependent claim 107 be allowed based on the limitations of its parent claim 90 and not based on the additional limitations in claim 107.

**The objection to allowable claims 95-97, 102, and 109**


The Examiner indicated that claims 95-97, 102, and 109 were objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Withdrawal of the objection to these allowable claims is requested since, as discussed above, the claims upon which they depend are believed to be allowable.

**Conclusion**

The final rejection based on Section 102(b) should be withdrawn because De La Huerga does not disclose the subject matter set forth in independent claim 90 upon which of the remaining pending claims depend, nor does De La Huerga disclose the additional subject matter set forth in dependent claims 93, 98-99, 111 and 114-115.

This response is being submitted within two months of the mailing of the final rejection and requests an advisory action.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: March 14, 2006

Charles G. Call, Reg. 20,406

**Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this *Response* is being transmitted by facsimile to the central facsimile number of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, (703) 872-9306, on March 14, 2006.



Dated: March 14, 2006

Signature

Charles G. Call, Reg. No. 20,406  
USPTO Customer No. 021253  
1161 Marlin Ct.  
Marco Island, FL 34145  
Ph. (617) 820-5227 - Fax (508) 629-6540